K. 13. 91

THE Leviathan HERETICAL: OR

The Charge Exhibited in Parliament againſt *M. Hobbs*, juſtified by the Refutation of a Book of his, Entituled The Hiſtorical Narration of *Hereſie* and the Puniſhments thereof.

By JOHN DOWEL, Vicar of *Melton-Mowbray* in *Leiceſter* Shire.

OXON
Printed by *L. Lichfield*, and are to be ſold by *A. Stephens* Bookſeller 1683.

TRINITY COLLEGE
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE

C

THE PREFACE.

THE Author of this Tract may thus be reproached Are not the Corps of dead men Sacred? To violate Tombs and Graves is Sacrilegious, why doth the Author intend to disturb the Manes of this universal Scholar? Will he not be permitted to sleep quietly in the Grave? How unworthy a thing is it to insult over a dead Lyon, and write a-

gainſt him who reſts in the duſt? The Author hears theſe words with a quiet mind; Certainly if to anſwer the works of thoſe who are dead be ſo Criminal, how hainous offendors have ſo many writers in all ages been? and how Capital a Delinquent is Mr. Hobs, *who hath by writeing endeavoured to render the ſentiments of the beſt and moſt learned men ridiculous. This Treatiſe diſcourſeth with his Ghoſt; He dyed in* 1679, *and the Treatiſe came out in* 80. *Tis his* umbra, *it carries his own lineaments, and ſpeaks his own language. A Reverend Neighbor Miniſter, a Learned*

Friend

Friend of the Authors, acquainted him with the language of Mr. Hobs *in private discourse, exactly agreeing with this Tract, and we find the most of it* cap 1. and 2. de Hæresi app. ad Leviath. Ed. Latina. *I will acknowledge him a Gentleman of great parts, of a wonderful vivacity to his old age; that he had so fine a Pen, that by the clearness, and propriety of his Style, and exactness of his method, he gain'd more Proselytes than by his Principles: few exceed him in both languages, but these aggrandize his Crimes; he ought not to have abused such excellent*

gainſt him who reſts in the duſt? The Author hears theſe words with a quiet mind; Certainly if to anſwer the works of thoſe who are dead be ſo Criminal, how hainous offendors have ſo many writers in all ages been? and how Capital a Delinquent is Mr. Hobs, *who hath by writeing endeavoured to render the ſentiments of the beſt and moſt learned men ridiculous. This Treatiſe diſcourſeth with his Ghoſt; He dyed in* 1679, *and the Treatiſe came out in* 80. *'Tis his* umbra, *it carries his own lineaments, and ſpeaks his own language. A Reverend Neighbor Miniſter, a Learned Friend*

Friend of the Authors, acquainted him with the language of Mr. Hobs *in private discourse, exactly agreeing with this Tract, and we find the most of it* cap 1. and 2. de Heresi app. ad Leviath. Ed. Latina. *I will acknowledge him a Gentleman of great parts, of a wonderful vivacity to his old age; that he had so fine a Pen, that by the clearness, and propriety of his Style, and exactness of his method, he gain'd more Proselytes than by his Principles: few exceed him in both languages, but these aggrandize his Crimes; he ought not to have abused such excellent*

qualifications, he hath ſo managed his Pen, that many believe him unanſwerable, yet let this Tract be conſidered whether he be not fully refuted, as to the Contents of his Narrative. I will appeal to the Learned World, whether Mr. Hobs *hath not thrown dirt and ugly expreſſions upon the Chriſtian Religion, the beſt of Councils, the whole Chriſtian Clergie, and hath abuſed the* Engliſh *Laws.*

It may be again objected, This Author durſt not write whilſt he was a live: Whom did Mr. Hobs *ever anſwer, but the clear Pen of the Arch-B. of* Armagh, *and the Great*

Pro-

Profeſſor Dr. Wallis? *In the Verſes which he made of himſelf he vaunts a Victory, the world is the Judge, if what he ſaith be true,* That there is an Eternal Fate and Neceſſity: *Why can he commend himſelf and diſcommend others; If in theſe Lines the Author does a thing ill, what reproof does he deſerve, he is hurried to it by a fatal Neceſſity. On this account his praiſing himſelf, and diſpraiſing others is groundleſs, he is charged with contradictions from a great one, of which he endeavours to vindicate himſelf; but 'tis in vain, his artifices are fruitleſs.*

One

One of his Moral and Political Principles is, That whatsoever is just or unjust, or to be received as true or false, is by the approbation or rejection of the Supream Power. *He writes his* Leviathan, *in which this is asserted and defended, yet in the same* Leviathan *he delivers those doctrines for true, which are judged Heretical by the Church of* England, *and Laws of the Kingdom: To evade this he useth all Art and Industry.*

In the First part of this Answer some Doctrines which he propagated in that Book are proved Heretical. In the Latter

ter part is proved, That these Doctrines are Criminal, and the persons that maintain'd them are liable to be punished by the Civil Majestrate. His Book being An Historical Narrative, *the Author is forc'd to have recourse to Books.* Mr. Hobs *gives us several Histories, but Quotes no Authour; whereupon the Answerer is compelled to cite the place whence he has taken them. No Memory, Reading, Understanding or Observation is infinite, therefore the Authour sometime useth this or the like expression, so as to him it occurs; he abstaines from all virulent*

languages

language; the hardeſt word, and that but once uſed, is Notoriouſly falſe. Mr. Hobs *gives occaſion to diſpute a great part of his* Leviathan, *but the Anſwerer proſecutes his deſign, to make good the Contradiction; as for Inſtance,* Mr. Hobs *averrs* That God hath Parts; *here is a juſt occaſion to diſpute The Nature of Spirits, but the Authour waves it, 'tis ſufficient to prove That the Church of* England *has judged that Propoſition Heretical, and thereupon has contradicted himſelf: He aſſerts,* That they who embrace the Liberty of the Will are allyed to the Manichees

chees. *This gives a fair opportunity to discourse of Liberty and Necessity: and he that seriously considers himself will find, the freedom of his Will ariseth not from the flexibility of the Understanding, flowing from various impressions upon that faculty, but from the Dominion which the Will has over it self, which the* Greeks *excellently express by* αὐτεξουσία, *but the Authour does not medle with that Controversie, contenting himself with the Demonstration of the absurdity of* Mr. Hobs *his Imputation, and that it is contrariant to the Doctrine of the Church of* England. *The*

Do-

Doctrine of the Sacred Trinity is religiously imbrac'd and entertain'd by the Church of England, *as it was by the Church of Christ in all ages; hence* Lucian *in his Philopatris jeer'd the Primitive Christians for believing such an incredible opinion, That* τρεῖς *should be* Ἓν, *and* Ἓν τρεῖς, (i. e.) Tres Unus, *and* Unus Tres, *Three Persons and One God, which scoff shews sufficiently the Faith of the Primitive Church. The Authour does not therefore dispute the Doctrine of the Trinity, but wipes off all that Varnish with which Mr.* Hobs *useth to hide the deformity of his*

his ſentiments, and makes him appear in his proper Colours; proves him Heretical, in being an enemy to the Faith, and Doctrine of the Church of England. *The like may be ſaid of other things which the Author treats of, the charge being made good, that* Mr. Hobs *has notoriouſly contradicted himſelf: His book is anſwered, and his great* Poſtulatum *demonſtrated to be falſe, in that he is forc'd to acknowledge thoſe things which are contrary to it.*

A DISCOURSE OF HERESIE.

Αἵρεσις is a Greek word, and the derivations that are given of *Heresie* from other words then αἱρέω, Greek or Latine, are fond and spurious. It was a word amongst the Philosophers, Greek and Latine, us'd for any Sect promiscuously, and so the ac-

ception is indifferent; but 'tis otherwise in sacred Scripture, in Ecclesiastical Writers, Fathers, and Historians, amongst whom 'tis alwaies us'd in an evil sense, the *Acts of the Apostles* being excepted, where αἵρεσις is alwaies translated *Sect*, only *Acts* 24. 14. 'tis probable 'tis used in an ill sense. The Reason may be this, The Catholick Church being one, what opinion was broached by any, contrary to the Catholic Church, receiv'd an ill stamp, and was called *Heresie*. The several opinions of the Philosophers were not branded with

with an ill name, they were not ſo fixed to one School, that it ſhould be impious to be of another: but 'tis otherwiſe in the Church of Chriſt (which owneth the Holy Jeſus to be her Maſter, and Founder, and glorying that ſhe is the Pillar and ground of Truth) whoſoever ſets up for himſelf, and divulgeth to the world an opinion contrary to the doctrine of the Church, he himſelf was judged an Heretick, and his opinion, an Hereſie: On this account in the Church of Chriſt, in all ages the word *Hereſie* was not a word

of a middle, or indifferent sense, but of an evil, and reproachful acceptation.

'Tis granted, that the Roman Empire was full of Philosophers when the Gospel was preached, and that some, not many, were converted: but it is denied that most of the Pastors of the Church were chosen out of these Philosophers: The primitive Christians had a mighty jealousie of them, and the greatest Philosophers which were Christians, were not Bishops: such were the Professors and Masters in the School of *Alexandria*, as *Pantanus*,

tænus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, &c. The Heathens objected againſt the Chriſtians, that few of them were Learned, which cauſed St. *Jerome* to write his Book *De Viris Illuſtribus*.

'Tis a gaeat atteſtation to the truth of Chriſtianity, that it appeared when Philoſophy ſo much flouriſhed in the world. Thoſe great Wits, which were ſo vaſtly furniſhed with Oratory, Learning, and the Tongues, if there had been any cheat acted by the Chriſtians they would eaſily have detected it: therefore when Chriſt

Chriſt profeſt that by his works he might be known, he and his Apoſtles wrought thoſe Miracles which gave a clear atteſtation to his doctrine. No doubt, but ſome of theſe Philoſophers were converted, but that (by reaſon of their great skill in Oratory and Philoſophy) moſt of the Primitive Church were choſen out of the number of theſe Philoſophers; 'Tis deny'd. In the Primitive Church for the three firſt Centuries, there was not a Philoſopher made a Biſhop.

When Chriſtians became numerous

numerous, they ſent their Children to be inſtructed in Philoſophy and the Liberal Sciences, who became brave perſons. But I am ignorant if any Philoſopher converted was made a Biſhop. What *Hobbs* averrs, that theſe Paſtors retaining their Philoſophical *Dogma's*, interpreting Scriptures according to their own Sect, that thus at firſt *Hereſie* entered into the Church, is not true; for *Hereſie* was crept into the Church in the Apoſtles time, St. *Paul* commands Chriſtians to beware of *Hereſies*, and St. *Peter* ſaith there are

thoſe who ſhall privily bring in damnable *Hereſies*. I do ackowledge *Tertullian* wrote ſmartly and truly, when he term'd Philoſophers the Patriarchs of Hereticks. *De præſcriptione*. Irenæus *Lib.* 2. *Cap.* 19. gives us an account from what Philoſophers the *Valentinian* and *Gnoſtick Hereſies* borrow'd their abſurd and monſtrous opinions, But then we muſt ſay, that theſe Hereticks were not Paſtors in the Church. The firſt that broach't thoſe prodigious opinions was *Simon Magus*, who was onely baptiz'd. In the

the firſt Century, there was not one Heretick, which was a Paſtor or Biſhop in the Church of Chriſt. The *Hereſie* of the *Nicholaitans* took its riſe from *Nicholas* one of the Seven Deacons: he did not broach that *Hereſie*, but ſome who miſinterpreted a paſſage of his, were the Authors of it. Nor any of the Chriſtian Clergy was the Author of any *Hereſie* in the ſecond Century. *Tatius* was a great Orator converted by *Juſtin Martyr*, and was the Author of the *Hereſie* of the *Encratites*, but he was not of the Clerical order. In the

third

third Century. *Novatus* a *Roman* Preſbyter broach't his *Hereſie* (I ſpeak according to the beſt knowledge I have in the Church hiſtory) *viz.* concerning the not receiving the *Lapſi* into Communion, but he was not a Philoſopher, nor was his opinions anywiſe a kin to the *Dogma's* of the heathen Philoſophers. *Nepos* was an *Ægyptian* Biſhop, not a profeſt Philoſopher; a perſon of great excellency in many things, the Author of the opinion of Chriſts reigning a 1000 years upon Earth, which opinion is founded, not upon any of the Principles of

of Philoſophy, but upon ſome paſſages in the Revelations. *Paulus Samoſatenus* made Biſhop of *Antioch*, was the broacher of many evil Doctrines, but he was not a Philoſopher.

The deſign of Mr. *Hobbs* eaſily appears, he every where caſts ſevere Reflections upon Chriſtianity, and its Profeſſors. The Apoſtle condemns vain Philoſophy, *Col.* 2. which in the ſence of *Cl Alexandrinus* is the Epicurean Philoſophy, from which *Hobs* borrows his Principles, *Moral*, *Natural*, and *Political*. "Upon the riſing of a

"new opinion, the Paſtors "of the Church aſſemble "themſelves, if the Author of "that Novelty perſiſted con-"trary to the determinati-"on of the Church, he was "laid aſide, and conſider-"ed as an heathen man (*i. e.*) "they excommunicated him, "other punishments they "could inflict none. This ſhall be eaſily granted, but what he ſubjoyns is utterly to be refuſed: That all the puniſhments the Church could inflict, was only ignominy; by this one ſtroke of his pen he hath cancel'd the New Teſtament. To ſay,

ſay, that excommunication, or caſting a man out of the Church, or eſteeming him as an heathen man, was but Infamy, 'tis to deny Chriſtianity. One of the great offices of the Church was Eccleſiaſtical diſcipline and the divine cenſures, of which excommunication was the ſevereſt, and is ſtill, if duely manag'd, the greateſt puniſhment. To be thrown out of the Church, to be deprived of the Prayers of the Church, to have no part in thoſe offices of Religion, by which the Grace and Favour of God is obtain'd, and to

be delivered to Satan, is this Infamy onely? To be outlaw'd, whereby a person is depriv'd of the benefit and liberty of the law; he is deprived of the liberty of his Countrey, he enjoys not a free air, house, nor harbor, and by reason a Capital penalty is inflicted on those who afford him any reception or give him any relief, he is exposed to the utmost peril of ruine except the outlawry be reverst. Is this only Infamy? The Calamity that Excommunication involves a person in, is far greater. For Excommunication acording

to

to the Doctrine of the Primitive Church was reputed a ſentence excluing the Excommunicated Perſons from the Kingdome of Heaven: and hence by *Tertullian* in his Apology called *futuri judicij præjudicium*. Is this only Infamy? He might have ſaid, that Chriſtianity is nothing, the promiſes and threatnings contained in it are mere Chimæra's: thence, tho they that embrace it, do entertain ſuch a belief, tis but a fancy, therefore all the evil which attends by excommunicationis onely Infamy. Excommunication was not

onely for *Hereſies*, but likewiſe for immoralities; and excommunication did not brand a man for an *Heretick*, but the perſon being rendred infamous for his *Hereſie* was (if in the boſome of the Church) caſt out. That *Heretick* and *Catholick* became not Relatives by this excommunication, nor by this did Heretick become a name, and a name of diſgrace both together. A Perſon by becoming an Heretick was excommunicated, this name did preceed, not follow excommunication. It muſt be acknowledged, that the *Hereſies* concern-

cerning the Trinity were very troubleſome in the Church, but not ſo vexatious during the ten Perſecutions, as in *Conſtantines* time, and after; but what is the cauſe, that when he propoſes the Troubles ariſing from the Doctrine of the Trinity, he would mix thoſe doctrines which were wholly alienated from the doctrine of the Trinity, as thoſe of the *Manichees*.

"For, ſaith he, according "to the uſual Curioſity of "Natural Philoſophy, they "could not abſtain from diſ-"puting the firſt principles of

"of Chriſtianity, into which
"they were Baptized in the
"name of the Father, Son,
"and Holy-Ghoſt. Some
"there were who made them
"Allegorical; others would
"make one Creator of Good
"another of Evil. This was
"the principal Tenet of the
"*Manichees*, who took their
"Names from one *Manes*.
"This Monſtrous opinion,
"that there were two Eter-
"nal Principles, Light and
"Darkneſs, theſe were two
"Contrary Gods, the one the
"Author of Good, the other
"of Evil. What is this to
"the Trinity? That which

he

he adds is not to be endured. "From which doctrine "they are not far diſtant "that now make the firſt "cauſe of Sinful actions "to be every man as to his "own Sin. Is this great Truth Manichiſm? To ſay man by his free-will is the Author of Sin. In commendation of himſelf in his own life thus? "I Printed then two treatiſes that ſtung the "Biſhop *Bramhal* in his Mo-"ther Tongue. The queſ. "tion at the time was, and "is ſtill, whether at Gods, "or our own choice we will: Can we will evil at Gods choice?

choice? We therefore do affirm expresly contrariant to Mr. *Hobs*, that the causation of Evil cannot be attributed to God without Impiety. He mentioning our late fatal Wars thus——————

——*Such Crimes and Sufferings I will not impute unto the Deity.*

I have no Sence if this be not a Repugnancy, in this Tract he affirms that those who assert, that the causation of Evil cannot be attributed to God are allyed to the *Manichees.*

And yet when in the Verses, which respect his life, he

he recounts the Engliſh Evils and Calamities during the Wars, he dares not impute them to the Deity. Truly how far this Opinion is from *Manichaiſm*, let the World Judge. Can any man have ſence to believe, that if Sin flows from God the firſt Cauſe, but it muſt be attributed to him? The *Manichees* believe an Eternal being the Author of all Evil. Take their Monſtrous opinion from themſelves. There was an Epiſtle which they in St. *Auſtin* called the *Fundamentum*, and thus begins. *Manichæus*

chæus Apostolus Jesu Christi, Providentiâ Dei Patris, hæc sunt salubria verba de vivo ac perenni Fonte. Manichæus the Apostle of Jesus Christ by the Providence of God the Father these are sound and wholsõe words flowing from a Liveing and Perpetual Fountain. In this Epistle, thus, *In exordio fuêre duæ substantiæ a se divisæ &c.* In the beginning there were two substances divided from one another. God the Father had the cõmand of Light; and then he proceeds to describe that kingdom, he then goes to the Kingdome of Darkness, which

which was at the ſide of Light, giveing a wild deſcription of that Kingdome of Darkneſs. He gives an account of the Black King of it, that he with his hideous Train aſſaulted God the Father, the King of Light; who being affraid of him, ſent ſome of his Troops, who mixing with the Black Regiments, formed his World. That what is Good muſt come from the King of Light, what is bad from the King of Darkneſs. Theſe frenzies of him who was Μανιαχ bewitched once that great man, who by the Grace of God bee

ing inlightned fell from them to the Catholic Church.

St. *Augustine* a Presbyter in *Hippo* disputes *Fortunatus* a *Manichæan* Presbyter of that City. Both dispute about the *Original of the Evil of Sin*, he assigns it to the *Black Prince*, & quitting the Cause, affirmed, it could have no other Original then from the Evil Nature of the Prince of Darkness. The like we find in his second dispute with *Felix* the *Manichæan*. Saint *Austin* assigns rightly this to the Free will of man. It cannot enter into my head, why Mr. *Hobs* should give this assertions

aſſertion, my underſtanding is too ſhallow to fathom this depth.

Nothing farther to be reproved till we come to the 6 page, onely this paſſage may receive a little Cenſure pag 6 "*Conſtantine* the great "was made by the valor and "aſſiſtance of the Chriſtian "Soldiers ſole Emperor. He not much regarding the peculiar Providence of God, takes nonotice of that great miracle of ye Croſs appearing at Noon, with this inſcription Ἐν τούτῳ νίκα. The whole Army of *Conſtantine* was inferior to *Magnentius* his Forces, a

small number of his Soldiers were Christians, it was more the peculiar action of the Arme of Heaven, which dissipated the Army of *Magnentius*, and gave the Eagles to *Constantine*. "In the latter "end of his time their arose "a dispute between *Alexan-* "*der* the Bishop, and *Arrius* "the Presbyter of that City. Here the Philosopher hath erred in his Chronology, for for the quarrel between them began before the *Licinian* Persecution, in the Tenth of *Constantin*'s; who commanded the Empire 37 years. Would this was the worst Er-

Error! "This Controver-
"ſy between the Inhabitants
"and Souldiers, preſently be-
"came a quarrel, and was
"the cauſe of much blood-
"ſhed in and about the Ci-
"ty. This ſo far concerned
"the Emperors Civil go-
"vernment, that he thought
"it neceſſary to call a general
"Council of all the Biſhops
"and other eminent Divines
"throwout the Roman Em-
"pire, to meet at the City
"of *Nice*. Indeed I read in
the Time of *Conſtantius*, the
Aarrians proſecuted the *Ca-
tholicks* with the greateſt fury
imaginable. The lamenta-

ble Tragedy of which is given us by an *Alexandrian* Synod, in their Letters to *Julius* Bishop of *Rome*. But that any murders were committed during the Reign of *Constantine*, I do not observe; but to lessen the honor of Christian Religion, he assigns the calling of that Council to the Peace of the Empire. The prime reason was the Establishing the Peace of the Church, and the Uniformity in Doctrine, which will be manifested, he said to the Fathers in his Exhortation to them, "That "they would fall in hand wth the

"the Articles of Faith, and "whatſoever they ſhould de-"cree therein, he would cauſe to be Obſerved: On which he thus Animadverts, "This "may perhaps ſeem a great "indifferency, then would "in theſe Days be approved "off. I know not the ſence of this reflection, for what could be more deſired by a Council of the Emperor, then to aſſure them that he would ratify thoſe Canons which they decreed, cencerning the things they were called for. The main of the diſcourſe is concerning his animadverſions on this Article, *Begotten*, not

not made, being of one Substance with the Father. Thus he. "In this they condemn "the doctrine of *Arius*, for "this word of one Substance, in Latine *Consubstantialis* in Greek ὁμοούσιος was "put as a touch-stone to discern an *Arrian* from a *Catholick*, and much ado their "was about it. Thus far tis true, but the verity of he subsequent discourse must be considered.

"*Constantine* himself at the "passing of it took it for an "hard Word, but yet approved it: The account is given by *Eusebius* in his Epistle to

to his flock, in *Cæsarea. Theod. lib.* 1. *cap.* 12. he acquaints them what a form of ſound words he preſented to the Synod at *Nice*, wch the Emperor and Synod allowed and approved: but the Synod was not ſatisfyed except this one word ὁμοούσιος was inſerted; whereupon the Synod entered into a long debate, and it paſt ἐκ ἀκριβάσεως &c. we did not admit without enquiry, which was after this manner. That word, *of one ſubſtance* was not to be underſtood according to any Corporeal paſſion; That it was not a Subſiſtence by any di-

vi-

vision or abscission from the Father. For an immaterial, intellectual, and incorporeal Nature can't be the subject of Corporeal passions, it behov'd that such things ought to be express'd in divine and arcane words. Thus our most wise and religious Emperour did Philosophise. And *Theodoret*, cap. 13. saith that word ὁμοούσιον was not invented by the Fathers, but received from former ages, and devolved from Fathers to Children. "*Constantine* "calling that word *Divine* "not because it was in the "divine Scripture, for it was not

not there, This is acknowledged. "But becauſe it "was to him an *Arcanum* not ſufficiently underſtood, Mr. *Hobs* takes all the occaſion to caſt a contempt upon the Council; tis fit their ſhould be ſuitable words, for tho the myſtery cannot be rightly underſtood, yet the ſence of the word may very well be underſtood. This word ὁμοούσιος may well enough be known, yet how the ſon of God ſhould be of the ſame ſubſtance with the Father, is not ſo intelligible, his reflection upon the Emperor is unworthy a Gentleman.

"And

"And in this appeared the "indifferency of the Empe- "ror, and that he had for his "end in calling the Synod, "not so much the Truth as "the Uniformity of the doc- trine, and the Peace of his "People yet depended on it.

This is a most notorious scandal; What! the famous *Constantine*, who put a period to persecution, restored peace to Christians, and made Christianity to florish, what this *Constantine* to play the Hypocrite? *Constantine* did desire the Uniformity in Doctrine, but not in an evil Doctrine, and the Peace of

of his people, but he would not build this upon the foundation of Sin and and *Hereſy*. Before that celebrated Emperor convened the Council, he was convinced of the true Faith, which appeared by his Diſcourſe with *Arrius*, and his large letter to the Churches in *Romania*. They who read the letters of *Conſtantine* concerning *Arrius* before the Council was call'd *Conſtantines* Edict, for the Convening of the Fathers, and his pious and ſweet Orations to the Council, will find, that *Conſtantine's* Deſigne was, that ſo great an

Assembly of the best Divines should settle the Church upon the Foundation of Truth and peace. Further, "the cause of the obscurity "of this word ὁμοούσιος pro- "ceeded clearly from the "difference of the Greek "and Roman dialect in the "Phylosophy of the *Peripa-* "*teticks*, what should cast Mr. *Hobs* into this sentiment I cannot understand: all his subsequent discourse is of *Essence* or οὐσία. As to this I know no difference in the Greek and Latine Dialect. Both Greek and Latine in the Sence of that agreed. The *Arrians* and

and *Catholicks* were Harmonious.

As to the οὐσία, why Mr. *Hobs* ſhould make their difference to conſiſt in that which they did agree, is to me unintelligible. The difference lay in the Adjective; there is one letter (ἰῶτα) that makes it; all Schools agree in this, that *like* is not the *ſame*; the *Arrians* would allow the ὁμοιούσιον, of a ſubſtance like to the father, but not this ὁμοούσιον of the ſame Subſtance with the Father. It manifeſtly appears to be a wild excurſion of Mr. *Hobs* to diſcourſe and quible upon

the Sence of this word Essence, and Substance, when the dispute did not lye in that; yet if there be a connexion in his discourse, in that, according to him, it did consist: but we will follow him in the Chace. "The first principle "of all Religion in all Nati-"ons is, God is. This is a "truth. That is to say, that "God really is something, "and not a meere fancy. This is not well sayd, It is with a diminution, for when we understand the Notion of a God, then we must have a conception of a being which is infinite-

finitely wiſe, Good, Powerful, Eternal. &c. "but that "which is really ſomething "is conſiderable alone by it "ſelf, as being ſomewhere, "ſo the Earth, the Air are "all of them things real; "whatſoever is in any place "hath dimẽſion, that is to ſay "Magnitude, and this which "hath Magnitude whether it "be viſible or inviſible is cal-"led by all the learned a Bo-"dy. If it be finite, & body or "Corporeal, if it be infinite, "it followeth, that all real things in that they are ſome-"where, are corporeal. which

Para-

Paragraph gives occasion of these 2 considerable things. 1. Whether there be any real being but that which is a body, and hath magnitude? 2. Wherein the Nature of Infinity consists? As to the first we will grant, that all learn'd men say whatsoever hath Magnitude is a Body; yet it must be affirmed, that the most and best of the *Literati* affirme, that there are real Beings, which are not bodys, and have no Magnitude, The chief of which we say is God, and tis impossible to have any conception of a God

God, but he muſt remove from him the conception of a Body; A Body muſt of neceſſity be diviſible and have ſuch parts wch can't be competent to a Deity, ſo that great Attribute of God's Immutability is loſt, He being a thing that may be changed; nor can this conſiſt with Gods Omnipotency; how can we think matter can be omnipotent, if we ſeriouſly caſt our Eyes upon this world to contemplate its beauty, order and greatneſs; Is't poſſible to conceive, that it is the product of Matter? No, the notion of a God muſt include in

in its self the Notion of Infinity. An Infinite cannot consist of finite parts; several finites cannot amount to one infinite, therefore God cannot have parts, wherefore it must be acknowledged, that there is a being which is not corporeal, and farther tis most certain that *Hobs* contradicts his own great principle, that the supream Power is the sole Judge of Good and Evil, Truth and Falsehood. He is a Subject to the King of *England* by whose law the Nicene Council was ratified, which decreed that God is an immate-

rial

rial and incorporeal Subſtance, and by his own Law hath declared that God hath no parts.

2. As to the Nature of a Thing infinite, there can be but two juſt acceptions of it.

It ſignifies a being which includes in it ſelf all perfections, and ſo it connotes the great God, the Eternal Majeſty, and this infers, there cannot be two Infinites, for there muſt not be two of all perfections. 2. Or a being that is boundleſs, or hath no terme. The name Infinite may be given to other things,

as

as an Infinite Sea because it cannot be exhausted, take what water out of it you please, the Sea remaines as full as before; Infinite words, Infinite Numbers, yet there are bounds to them, the Sea may be fathomed, Words have their Numbers, none can imagine a line drawn to such a length but it may be drawn longer, fancy any number, there may be an addition, these are not properly Infinites, as a little Stick we see bounded, yet divided it may be into Infinite parts *(i. e.)* it will be still capable of division, for nothing

is

is material, but each part will be material: 'Tis clear that nothing can be eſteemed infinite but Space, in my apprehenſion. Space ſimply conceived is nothing, 'tis a mere imagination, ſo it appears, that nothing Corporeal is Infinite. That which he ſubjoyns concerning Eſſence, and Deity ſhall be conſidered, what he ſays of Whiteneſs and Blackneſs will be granted but what he intends by it, ſhall, be preſently examined. "Theſe Real things, are called by the "Latine Philoſophers *Entia*, "*ſubjecta*, *ſubſtantiæ*, and by "The

"the Greek Philosophers,
"πάντα, ὑποκείμενα, ὑποστάμενα
"The other which are In-
"corporeal, are called by the
Greek Philosophers, οὐσίαι
"συμβεβηκότα, φανταστὰ but
"most of the Latine Philoso-
"phers use to convert οὐσία
"into *substantia*, and so con-
"found real and corporeal
"things with incorporeal,
"which is not well. For Es-
"sence and Subsistance signifie
"divers things. To which
'tis thus returned; why doth
Mr. *Hobs* call any thing In-
corporeal, when he asserts
there's nothing but what is
a Body?

Wha

2. What philoſophers ſay *ſubſtantiæ* are πρῶτα, other things are ſo called which are not *ſubſtantiæ*; and who ſaith that White and Black are *ſubſtantia* and *ſubjecta*, ſeeing white and black have their *ſubſtrata*, which are different from them, and they are ſeparable, for that *ſubſtratum* which is now white, may anon be black.

3. By the Greek Philoſophers Incorporeal things are not called συμβεβηκότα, for theſe are *accidentia*; nor φαντάσματα, for the *ſpectra* are ſubjects of the eye, and what is the object of ſenſe is materi-

al, but they are by them called αὐλα σώματα πνεύματα.

The Latine Authors doe well in translating οὐσία sometimes *Substantia*, sometimes *Essentia*, Essence and Substance do differ, but the Greek is copious. οὐσία signifies Essence and Substance, expresly *Arist lib.* 4 *cap.* 9. gives these two significations of οὐσία, that it signifies both Essence and Substance. The Latines take their measures from the Greeks. They confound not Essence and Substance, who give the just Translation according to the true sense, it having divers acceptations,

and

and therefore this ὁμοούσιον is truely rendred *One of the ſame Subſtance.*

'And this miſtake is re-
'ceiv'd, and continues ſtill in
'theſe parts, in all diſputes
'both of Philoſophy and Di-
'vinity; for in truth *Eſſen-*
'*tia* ſignified no more than if
'we ſhould talk ridiculouſly
'of the *Iſneſs* of the thing,
'that is, (By whom all things
'were made) this is prov'd
'out of St. *John*, Cap. 1. Verſe
'1, 2, 3. and *Heb.* Cap. 1.
'Ver. 3. and that again out
'of *Gen.* 1. To make thoſe
expreſſions which Philoſo-
phers us'd ridiculous he thus

form'd this word *Isneß* St. *Jerome* upon these words of the wise man, *There's no new thing under the Sun*, quotes his Master *Donatus*, reading upon *Terence*, *Nil dictum, quod non prius dictum; Desperent qui nostra ante nos dixerunt.* That great Rhetorician, and Gramarian might be the Inventor of some new words, or new explanation of the same thing but not else. Mr. *Hobbs* is the sole Inventor of the word *Isneß*, but his *Leviathan* principles were prepared to his hands by fanciful and not thinking men; words mightily prevail. The

re-

reverend Mr. *Calvin* againſt the Anabaptiſts, and other wild perſons, us'd the word Phanatick. The Great Monk in his Southern Journey which he manag'd with as curious and fine Stratagems as ever a General did, to expoſe his adverſaries (the Army abounding with ſuch ſort of Creatures) he cal'd them Phanaticks, which was of great efficacy; perhaps 'tis Mr. *Hobbs* his imagination by this odd word *Iſneſs* to render *Eſſentia*, us'd by the Philoſophers, contemptible e re long (it may be) on the Stage. And this *Iſneſs* amongſt

Drolls

Drolls may serve to make a Conceit more pleasant: If He would have recollected what he said of Speech. Cap. 40. *Leviathan*; that words signifie as they are usually understood, then if *Isneſs* had been used in a common vogue to denote the same with *Essence* who would have reprov'd it? He quarrels with the Fathers and Divines of Note for confounding the *Concrete* with the *Abstract*, *Deus* with *Deitas*, *Ens* with *Essentia*, *Sapiens* with *Sapientia*, *Æternus* with *Æternitas*: In my apprehension, the Philosophers do not confound themselves,

for

for they ſuppoſe a diſtinction, which to me thus appears: *Eſſentia* the Nature, *Ens* the thing it ſelf. I may have apprehenſions of a thing, and the Nature of a thing; the Philoſophers make no confuſion, none of them ſay that *Sapiens* is *Sapientia*; if they did ſo, they might truly ſay, that *Covetouſneſs* is a *Covetous* man, and *Holyneſs* is a *Holy* man &c. as he by this would render them contemptible: by a *Concrete* they underſtand a Thing compounded of *Subſtance* and *Forms*, by an *abſtract* they conceive a *Form* without the

Subject

Subject as *Wisdome*, not considering the man that is *Wise*. I may at the same time have a conception of *Wisdom*, and not have the conception of a *wise* man. No Philosopher doth say that *wisdom*, and a *wise* man are the same, nor *Covetousness*, and a *Covetous* man are the same. The Schools and Philosophers in speaking of the *Deity* do fear to speak of *God* with any irreverence, & therefore upon just ground admit not any composition in *God* amongst them. *Deitas* and *Deus* are the same, and by reason that there is nothing Eternal, but *God*, in Him

Him *æternus & æternitas* are the ſame: For when we concieve a diſtinction in the mind of man, it is concerning created beings; but we have none ſuch in God. *Eſſence* and *Exiſtence* of created beings afford two different *modes* of concieving, but the contrary is of God. There is but one conception of the *Eſſence* and *Exiſtence* of a God, and of them there is no ſort of diſtinction: The *Abſtract* and *Concrete*, and *Concrete* and *Abſtract* are the ſame, therefore it muſt be ill ſaid of him: For if *Deitas* abſtracted be *Deus*, we make two Gods of one.

Muſt then no ſuch word as *Eſſence* be uſed? only Body, ſurely the word Nature may be uſed? what is this *Corporeal*? by that means I may uſe the word *Eſſential*. His aim is higher, that is, at the Trinity, from that myſtery of Faith he takes all his Grandeur. Thus Mr. *Hobs*. *The Attributes therefore of God in the abſtract, when they are put for God, are put Metonymically, which is a common thing in Scripture; as for Example*, Prov. 8. 23. *Before the Mountains were ſetled, before the Hills brought forth was I. The Wiſdom there ſpoken of being*

the

he wiſdom of God, ſignifies the ſame with the wiſe God. In the ſacred Scripture by the *Wiſedom of God*, is ſometimes meant the *Son of God*, the Ὁ Λόγος, the *Eternal Word*, and this is not denyed by the *Arrians* themſelves. They acknowledging that Wiſdom mentioned by *Solomon* is Chriſt the Son of God, do endeavour to prove him not ποίημα Θεοῦ, becauſe he is ſaid to be according to the greek *fundata ſum*, and as cited by *Fulgentius contra object. Arrianorum obj. Creavit me Initium viarum ſuarum.* A Creature is not of the ſame ſubſtance, tho the *Arrians* falſly

ly applyed those words, yet tis certain that by the wisdome of God mentioned in that chapter, was not as Mr. *Hobs* saith *Metonimically* by them taken for the wise God, but a being subsistent by it self; what he thinks of the other part of the Creed is not amiss, but to say that it was never questioned amongst Christians (except by the *Arrians*) that Christ was God Eternal is an huge mistake. Before *Arrius* appear'd, several *Heretick*s denied it, and *Arrius* according to this word ὁμοούσιος, as appears by his Letters and Confession would not scruple to call Christ

Chriſt the Eternal God.

He adds, *That no man can be made an Heretick* by conſequence this ſhall not create any diſpute but what means he when he ſaith *becauſe that form was not put into the body of the Creed, but directed onely to the Biſhops, there was no reaſon to puniſh any Lay-perſon that ſhould ſpeak to the contrary*; I cant find his meaning: for the form ὁμοούσιον was in the Creed, and by the Authority of that Council every perſon who did not receive it was *anathematiz'd*. Perhaps he means this, that *God hath no Parts* is not in the

form of the Creed. This is acknowledged, that the Council did not put that into the forme of the Creed, yet it was determined by the Council. The Letters which *Eusebius* wrote were *Synodical.*

By the superscriptions it appears, that the Contents of those Epistles did not concerne onely the Bishop, but all the People. *Socrates, Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 5. gives a full account of this; he wrote an Epistle of the *Decrees* and *Acts* of which *Eusebius* sent by order of the Council. εἰς τῆς παλαστίνης Καισάβειαν, and this

this ſame Epiſtle ſaith *Socrates Euſebius* ſent τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Ἀλεξανδρέων, to the Church of *Alexandria*, to thoſe of *Lybia, Egypt and Pentapolis.* What the *Synod* by a common ſuffrage paſt, when the conciliary decrees were ſent to all the Churches: Mr. *Hobs* would make the World believe that they being directed by the Biſhops were onely obligatory of them. The Contrary in *Theodoret. Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 5. *Cap.* 12. The Synodical Epiſtles of the *Nicene* Fathers were directed not to the Biſhops, for the Biſhops were preſent in Coun-

form of the Creed. This is acknowledged, that the Council did not put that into the forme of the Creed, yet it was determined by the Council. The Letters which *Eusebius* wrote were *Synodical.*

By the superscriptions it appears, that the Contents of those Epistles did not concerne onely the Bishop, but all the People. *Socrates, Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 5. gives a full account of this; he wrote an Epistle of the *Decrees* and *Acts* of which *Eusebius* sent by order of the Council. εἰς τῆς παλαστίνης Καισάβειαν, and this

this ſame Epiſtle ſaith *Socrates Euſebius* ſent τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Ἀλεξανδρέων, to the Church of *Alexandria*, to thoſe of *Lybia, Egypt and Pentapolis.* What the *Synod* by a common ſuffrage paſt, when the conciliary decrees were ſent to all the Churches: Mr. *Hobs* would make the World believe that they being directed by the Biſhops were onely obligatory of them. The Contrary in *Theodoret. Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 5. *Cap.* 12. The Synodical Epiſtles of the *Nicene* Fathers were directed not to the Biſhops, for the Biſhops were preſent in Coun-

cil but to the Church of *Alexandria*, and to all our beloved brethren in *Ægypt*, *Libia* and *Pentapolis*. These being thus directed there was a reason to punish any Layperson which should speak to the contrary. 'But what 'was the meaning of this 'Doctrine, that God hath no 'parts? Was it made Heresy 'to say that God who is a real Substance, cannot be con-'sidered or spoken of as here 'or there, or any where 'which are parts of places? 'Or that there is any real 'thing without length every 'way, that is to say which hath

'hath no magnitude at all Fi-
'nite or Infinite? Or is there
'any whole Subſtance, whoſe
'two halves or three thirds
'are not the ſame with that
'whole? Or did they mean to
'condemn the Argument of
'*Tertullian*, by which he con-
'futed *Apelles* and other He-
'reticks of his time, namely
'whatſoever was not corpo-
'real, was nothing but phan-
'taſm, and not Corporeal for
'Heretical? no certainly,
No Divines ſay that, What
is the meaning of this, that
God hath no Parts?

To explain this he addſe-
veral queſtions, whether God

considered or spoken of, as here and there, or that there is any real thing without length every way *i. e.* hath magnitude at all Finite or Infinite: 'tis returned to those questions. God is an Infinite substance without magnitude; nor can it be said, that a magnitude is infinite; 'tis impossible to think that to be infinite, to which there can be an addition. His third captious question is frivolous; 'Tis true if that substance be *material*, but it is not true in an *immaterial* substance. To the Fourth let any Divine be produced who saith that what is

is not *Corporeal* is a *Phantaſme*. This is the queſtion, whether all beings which have a real *Subſtance* be *Corporeal*, the *Epicureans* affirme it, other Philoſophers and Chriſtians wholly deny it, indeed it muſt be affirmed, that ſometimes by *Corpus* or a *Body* is meant any real being, or whatever hath any *real* being; and this it is by ſome conceived to be the ſence of *Tertullian*; Thus St. *Auguſtine* vindicates *Tertullian de Geneſi ad Literam Lib.* 10. *Cap. ult. Tertull. de Animâ Cap.* 7 *Omne Corporale eſt paſſibile.* Upon that St. *Auguſtine, debuit ergò mutare ſenten-*

tenti-

tentiam. He ought therefore to change his opinion; which he mentions in another place, God is a body, *adversus Praxeam.* I cannot believe that he was so Childish as to believe the Nature of God is *passible*; but that by this Argument, whatsoever was not *Corporeal* was *nothing*, should be the argument whereby he confuted *Apelles*, and other Hereticks in his times is a Conclusion above the reach of my understanding. He disputes against *Hermogenes* who asserted an Eternal *matter* coexistent with God, who out

of

of that created this *Univerſe*. What Argument can be uſed againſt *Hermogines* taken from propoſition, *Omne quod eſt Corpus eſt.* There is nothing but Body. *In Cap.* 35. *Tertullian* explains himſelf; he takes an Argument from *Hermogines* his contradicting himſelf, *primâ facie materia videtur eſſe incorporalis*; at the firſt ſight matter ſeems to be incorporeal: but having ſeriouſly pondered what he ſaith, *Matter* will be found neither *Corporeal*, nor *Incorporeal*. That I grant, ſome *ſubſtance* is onely *Incorporeal*, for the *Subſtance* it ſelf is the Body

dy of every thing when *Corporeal* and *Incorporeal* are mentioned; nothing else will be admitted. Thus he explaining his sence of *Corpus* that it is *Substantia*, he confutes *Hermogines* not from the recited proposition, but his own contrarietys; the same may be applyed to what he disputes against *Marchiæan Apelles* and *Praxeas*. Therefore against Mr. *Hobs* I may be confident to averr that *Tertullian* never attempts the refuting *Apelles*, or any other Heretick in his time, from this *Topick*, *whatsoever was not Corporeal was a Phantasme.*

Tis

Tis true the *Nicene* Fathers went to eſtabliſh one *Individual* God in Trinity, to aboliſh the diverſity of *Species* in God: and tis not true, that they did not intend to deſtroy the diſtinction of *here* and *there*, for the Council in explaining the word did ſay, that it could not be underſtood of God, κατ' ἀπουσίαν not κατ' ἐνέργειαν, for the Eſſence of God was ἄυλος καὶ ἀσώματος, the diſcourſe is not concerning the intent of the Council. Since the Council judged the nature of God to be Immaterial and Incorporeal, they did conclude that an

an Incorporeal Substance was not a contradiction; therefore the holy Fathers must needs have thought that God had no extended parts; nor any sort of parts; and therefore not be considered as *here* and *there*. What a force is don by him to the Apostles question; St. *Paul* asks the *Corinthians, Is Christ divided?* which he thus interprets. 'He did 'not think, they thought 'him impossible to be consi- 'dered as having hands and 'feet, but that they might 'think him (alluding to the 'manner of the *Gentiles*) one 'of the sons of God, but not the

'the only begotten. Thus ex-
'pounded in *Athanaſius* his
'Creed, *Not Confounding the*
'*Perſons, nor dividing the Sub-*
'*ſtance*, *i.e.* God is not divi-
'ded into 3 Perſons *Peter*,
'*James* and *John*, nor are the
'3 Perſons one and the ſame
'Perſon. Tis granted, that
the Fathers intended the
laſt, but it is denied that they
had any ſuch intent, *by not*
dividing the Subſtance, to have
a reſpect unto various Indi-
viduals, for in that *diviſion*,
the Perſons & ſubſtances are
divided, the Subſtances are
different and not the ſame;
but in the perſons of the In-

an Incorporeal Substance was not a contradiction; therefore the holy Fathers must needs have thought that God had no extended parts; nor any sort of parts; and therefore not be considered as *here* and *there*. What a force is don by him to the Apostles question; St. *Paul* asks the *Corinthians*, *Is Christ divided?* which he thus interprets. 'He did 'not think, they thought 'him impossible to be consi- 'dered as having hands and 'feet, but that they might 'think him (alluding to the 'manner of the *Gentiles*) one 'of the sons of God, but not the

the only begotten. Thus ex-
'pounded in *Athanaſius* his
'Creed, *Not Confounding the*
'*Perſons, nor dividing the Sub-*
'*ſtance*, *i.e.* God is not divi-
'ded into 3 Perſons *Peter*,
'*James* and *John*, nor are the
'3 Perſons one and the ſame
'Perſon. Tis granted, that
the Fathers intended the
laſt, but it is denied that they
had any ſuch intent, *by not*
dividing the Subſtance, to have
a reſpect unto various Indi-
viduals, for in that *diviſion*,
the Perſons & ſubſtances are
divided, the Subſtances are
different and not the ſame;
but in the perſons of the In-

dividual Trinity, the Subſtance is the ſame. And in created beings the *Perſona* of every Individual is really diſtinct, not onely from the eſſence and perſon of another Individual; but from the Subſtance in which it doth ſubſiſt; which appears in the Incarnation of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who aſſumed not the Perſon but Nature of Man: but the miſtery being great above all the underſtanding and apprehenſion of man; it is rather the object of Faith, than Reaſon. My main undertaking againſt Mr. *Hobs* in this

this Tract is not to illuſtrate or prove the meaning, but to manifeſt that he has not cleared himſelf of the contradiction, and that in his attempts he throws himſelf into new abſurdities, one of which is this *Paragraph*.

'But *Ariſtotle*, and from 'him all the *Greek* Fathers, 'and other learned men, when 'they diſtinguiſh the general 'latitude of a word, they 'call it *diviſion*, as when they 'divide the *Animal* into *Man* 'and *Beaſt*, they call theſe 'εἴδη, *Species*, and when they 'again divide the *Species Man* 'into *Peter* and *John*, they

'call these μέρη *partes indivi-*
'*duæ*. And by this confound-
'ing the division of the Sub-
'stance with the distinction of
'words, divers men have been
'led into Error of attribut-
'ing to God a name, which
'is not the name of any Sub-
'stance at all, *viz. Incorporeal*.
'Tis true that the Philoso-
phers, when they divide *A-*
nimæ or the *Genus* into *Men*
or *Beasts*, they call these εἴδη
Species, but when they again
divide the *Species Man*, into
Peter and *John*, they never call
these μέρη *Partes Individuæ*, for
μέρη are *partes dividuæ*, there-
fore *Individua* are called

'Ατο-

Ἄπμα; but what ſence there is in his deduction, I'le give, when I underſtand it. There is a ſubſtance, which is Incorporeal; the Philoſophers were led into that truth by obſerving the operations of ſome beings which are not Corporeal, where it muſt needs follow, that theſe eſſences are Incorporeal; and by ſome other Arguments: but that they ſhould be led into this, which he calls an Error by confounding the diviſion of Subſtance with the diſtinction of words, is a thing far from Truth, and any conception of mine.

'Many Heresies which 'were Antecedent to the first 'general Council were con-'demned, as that of *Manes* (he 'might have added *Marcion*) 'by the first article *I believe in one God.* This was not di-rected onely against them, but also against the *poluthe-isme* of the Heathens, 'tho to 'me it seems still to remain 'in the Doctrine of the 'Church of *Rome*, which so 'attributes a liberty of the 'will to men, as that their 'will and purpose to commit 'sin not should proceed from 'the cause of all things God, 'but originally from them-'selves

'ſelves or from the Devil. Indeed *Marcion* and *Manes* attributed Sin to an evill God, but the Church of *Rome*, the Church of *England*, and all other Churches look upon that Opinion as Heretical: why this Doctrine of the Liberty of the will is to remain in the Church of *Rome*, this is to palliate. This Doctrine continues in the Church of *England*, and in all the Churches of Chriſt. The Devil does vehemently tempt to ſin, but he is not the cauſe of ſin; hence that good *Axom* is received by all knowing men, *No body is injured but*

but by himſelf, that which is properly an Evil is the Evil of Sin, which our ſelves only can inflict upon us; but how comes it to paſs that this Doctrine of the *L*iberty of the Will ſhould be oppoſed by this Article, *I believe in one God?* they who maintain that Doctrine firmly believe this Article, They ſay that the one true God is infinitely glorious in all perfections, amongſt which is the Liberty of his will, he created all things, amongſt which he created Rational beings which he endowed with the Liberty of Will, whereby they are made

made capable of being vertuous, and ſo to be rewarded, or vitious, and ſo to be puniſhed; where is there by this ſentiment a ſetting up another God? by God he means one firſt Cauſe which neceſſarily moved from all eternity, from which neceſſary cauſe there flows an infinite concatenation of neceſſary cauſes, whence if any ſay, that there is a Liberty of the Will, he muſt aſſigne another firſt Cauſe, and from thence oppoſe this Article *I believe in one God*; we ſay there is but one firſt Cauſe, and that a free Agent, whence ſprings the Liberty

berty of Rational Beings. By the account which Mr. *Hobs* gives of God, and by ſeveral of his opinions it muſt be concluded, that he believes *there is no God.* One of his ſayings is, *He that ſaith there is no mind in the World, hath no mind.* This is a gingling quibble, beſides many groſs abſurdites with wch his opinion is charged, this is no mean one; *God is the Author of Sin*; to which he replys *Leviath. cap.* 46. by this diſtinction *God is not the Author of Sin, but he is the cauſe.* The Author is he who commands, the Cauſe by whoſe Power a thing is done;

done. This with many other diſtinctions he frames, which are more ſubtle, perplext, and remote from ſence, then any of the School-mens, for which he ſo much condemns them, certainly every cauſe is the Author of a thing. He that commands, is by that a *moral cauſe*. But he that is a cauſe by enabling to do, is a *Phyſical* cauſe of Sin, Godcan't be ſuch a cauſe; but it may be queried whether God, according to Mr. *Hobs*, ever gave any laws to man-kind, for unqueſtionably if the rule of Juſtice, & Injuſtice Good and Bad, true and falſe be the will

of

of the supream power; God never gave laws to man kind, 'perhaps (saith he) the *An-* 'thropomorphites were then condemned, but this cãnot be 'for they appeared not untill 'the time of *Valens*. This is no great matter. It is certain that the Council did condemn all those who ascribed any parts to God, which the *Anthropomorphites* did, yet if *Epiphanius* be credited, *heret.* 70. *Audianus* a *Mesopotanican* the Author of this Heresy of the *Anthropomorphites* florished in the time of *Arrius*, when the *Nicene* Council was convened.

'No

'No other puniſhment was ordained by *Conſtantine* than 'Deprivation and Baniſh-'ment; and that not onely 'of *Biſhops* and *Paſtors* who 'refuſed to ſubſcribe to the 'Faith; thus did Hereſie '(which at firſt was the name 'of a private opinion, and no 'crime, was by vertue of a 'law of the Emperor, made 'onely for the Peace of the 'Church) become a Crime 'in a Paſtor and puniſhable. How many *Errata's* in this Paraptaph? Hereſy in the Church of Chriſt was always a Crime, and never the name of an opinion. This I prov'd

before; let it be granted, that every Sin is not a Crime, and that every Crime is that wch is punishable; 'tis a trifle to be lirigious in words, every sin is certainly punishable; some Sins are greater than others, so there is a difference in Crimes, there are Crimes which are onely discernable by Almighty God, and so punishable at his tribunal; but that Heresy should be a Crime onely because the civil power inflicts a corporal punishment, cannot be understood by any, but such a person, who bids a defyance not only to the Christian Re-

Religion, but to all other Religions which aſſert a future retribution, or concludes that the great God doth puniſh evil men in this life by ſome extraordinary methods. But that Hereſy after this decree of the council became onely a Crime puniſhable in the *Biſhops* and *Paſtors*, whether it be true or not, is not much material. In the Paſtors the People were always puniſhed, for they followed their Paſtors in baniſhment. *Baſil* with a curious pen delineating the miſerys and calamitys under which the *Orthodox* Biſhops

and Pastors groan'd, likewise gives us the description of those dreadful sufferings, with which the people were oppprest.

Eusebius giveing us an account of an Edict of *Constantine* against Hereticks, in that not onely Bishops and Pastors, but all sorts of Hereticks were involved. *de vitâ Constant. lib. 3 cap. 62.* And having proved before that *Arianisme* was decreed an Heresy not for the peace of the Church, but likewise that there might be an agreement in the same faith, which was necessary to salvation, we may

may juſtly ſay that every line of that Paragraph is notoriouſly untrue. To leſſen the Eſteem of the *Nicene* and the 4 General Councils, ſays he, 'There aroſe new Hereſies a-'bout the Interpretation of 'the Creed, and partly a-'bout the Holy Ghoſt, of 'which the *Nicene* Coun-'cil had not determined, 'And afterwards concer-'ning the Holy Ghoſt. *Neſtorius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* & ſome others denied the divinity thereof. The *Pneumatomachi* appearing after the Council of *Nice* had preten-

ded for themſelves the ſilence of the *Nicene* Fathers; to which *Baſil*, *Nazianzen*, *Theoderet*, *Epiphanius* anſwer, there being no queſtion moved concerning it, the Council acquieſed in the opinion, and right Faith of the Univerſal Church, concerning the Divinity of the Holy-Ghoſt.

Why ſhould the Fathers confirme that truth which was not queſtioned, but taken for granted, or condemne that for Hereſy which was not preached, yet if not in a ſet forme of words decreed, yet

yet in truth and by good conſequence, the ſence of the Fathers as to that Article was given. For St. *Baſil Epiſt.* 78. *Hieronom. Epiſt.* 65. *Epip. hæreſi* 74 take off, and anſwer that objection; *Epiphanius* and *Athanaſius* prove it thus, that the ſame glory which is given to the Father, and to the Son, is likewiſe given to the Holy Ghoſt; for the Symbol is, *I believe in God the Father, and in God the Son; and I believe in the Holy Ghoſt.* This Divine Faith, fixed upon the Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt, as one

and

and the same God, gives the true sence of the Council.

The great mistake concerning *Nestorius* must only be attributed to Mr. *Hobs* his animadversion: for it was not *Nestorious*, but *Macedonius* who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. *Nestorius* was a great adversary to the πνευματόμαχοι, therefore in *Socrates Lib.* 7. *Cap* 31. we find that *Nestorius* was so great an Enemy to the *Macedonians* that when he was *Bishop* of *Constantinople* he drove the *Macedonians* out of all their Churches in that City, and in the *Hellespont*.

Con-

'Concerning the Parts eſtabliſhed there aroſe diſ-'putes about the Nature of 'Chriſt, aud the word *Hy-'poſtaſis. (i. e.)* Subſtance, 'for of perſons there was yet 'no mention made, their 'Creed being written in 'Greek, in which Language 'there is no word that an-'ſwereth to the Latine word '*Perſona*; and the Union, as 'the Fathers called it, of the 'Humane and Divine Nature 'in Chriſt *Hypoſtolical* cauſed '*Eutyches*, and after him *Dioſ-'curus* to affirme there was 'but one Nature in Chriſt,

think-

'thinking that whenſoever 'two things are united, they 'are one.

Tis true the Latine word *Perſona* is uſed in the Latine Church, which Church embraced likewiſe the word *Hypoſtaſis*, and all differences concerning thoſe words were within a while compoſed, and all Orthodox Chriſtians in that Church who know the Greek Language do receive the word *Hypoſtaſis* in the ſame ſenſe which the Latines uſe *Perſona*. The famous *Nicene* Councils having decreed, that there were two Natures in Chriſt

Chriſt, and one *Hypoſtaſis* which ſignifies *Subſiſtence*, this exactly anſwers to the Latine *Perſona*. *Neſtorius* Biſhop of *Conſtantine* broch'd this Hereſy that in Chriſt there were two diſtinct perſons, and ſo *Mary* the Mother of Chriſt was not Θεοτόκος the Mother of God: againſt him *Eutyches* excellently diſputed in the Fourth Action, in the Council of *Conſtantinople*; *Eutyches* declining the one, fell into another Hereſy, aſſerting that there was but one Nature in Chriſt, yet the humane Nature was ſwallowed up by the

Divine, and was not of the flesh of the Virgin, but descended from God. A great promoter of this impiety was *Dioscurus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, a wicked and lewd person, a Monster rather than a Bishop. These were condemned in the *Chalcedonian* Council. I will grant that the Disciples of *Eutyches* did say, *If two Natures there would be two hypostases*, I will say it was an Heretical illation, and affirme, that the Latine word *Persona* answers to the Greek ὑπόστασις, according to the Sence of the Churches both *East* and *West*. ὑπόστασι

is not *Substance* but *Subsistence*, to which *Persona* directly answers. But (saith he) in the *Nicene* Creed there's no mention of *Hypostasis* or *Hypostatical* Union, nor of Corporeal, nor Incorporeal, nor of parts; but this was acknowledged by the Fathers in that Council, there was the ὁμοούσιος which necessarily infers it: after a dispute concerning the sense of these words, they all agreed in the same Faith, and that *Hypostasis* is as well as *Persona*, entertained by the universal Church; not signifying *Substantiam* as usally; but *Subsistentiam*; from the *Nicene* decree must [illegible]

ceſſity flow the *Hypoſtatical Union*. Tho the word *Incorporeal* was not uſed in the *Nicene* Creed, yet it is uſed in *Euſebius* his *Synodical* Epiſtles, who ſtyles God ἄυλος and ἀσώματος, *Immaterial* and *Incorporeal*, as before aſſerted: but invidiouſly to throw dirt upon the Fathers; ſuch Points (ſaith he) 'were not neceſſary 'to Salvation, but ſet a broach 'for oſtentation of learning, 'or elſe to dazle men with de- 'ſigne to lead them towards 'ſome ends of their own. By which he charges the moſt humble perſons with pride, the moſt ſincere with Hypo-

criſie

criſie, and the moſt unbiaſſ'd with ſecular aims. Tis true that it was not judged neceſſary to Salvation, that vulgar perſons ſhould know what *Hypoſtaſis* and *Perſona* intended, as appears by that Council held at *Alexandria* by *Athanaſius* Biſhop of that *See*; *Euſebius* of *Vercelles*, and *Lucifer* of *Calaris*, Two Weſtern Biſhops, who after they had contended about theſe words, were united in this *Nicene* article, that *Chriſt was the Eternal Son of God, and really God, and that it was an Article of the Chriſtian Faith, & neceſſary to Salvation.* What

he says concerning St. *Cyprian* is nothing to my design, nor shall I make any remarks upon his discourse of the Usurpation of the Bishop of *Rome*, or take cognizance of what he says of the punishment ordained against Hereticks in the Reign of K. *Rich.* the 2. and succeding Princes, for this is nothing to my purpose; my whole designe is to make good the contradiction with which he is charged. I must therefore have no regard to any penal statutes in Causes Ecclesiastical, until the Reign of Queen *Elisabeth.* I charge him with these

theſe heretical propoſitions, contrary to the doctrine of the Church of *England*, to whom he is obliged by the laws of the King to be Subject. 1. That God hath parts. 2. That Chriſt is not of the ſame Subſtance with the Father. 3. That the Perſons in the ſacred Trinity are temporall; All which are declared Heretical by the lawes, and Church of *England*. But Mr. *Hobs* would evade the two laſt Heretical propoſitions, by ſaying he believes the Doctrine of the Trinity as the Church hath explained it in the Catechiſme. When the

the Minister asks the *Catecu*
mene, what dost thou chiefly lear
in these Articles of thy Belief
He answers, *I learn first to be*
lieve in God the Father, who cre
ated me and all the World. 2. I
God the Son who hath redeem
ed me and all Mankind. 3. I
God the Holy-Ghost who hat
Sanctified me and all the Elec
People of God. What is there
intended but this, tha
God in his own person di
create all things, in the Per
son of his Son did redeem
Mankind, in the person o
the Holy Ghost did Sanctifi
the Church: What clearlie
concerning the Divine per
son

ſons, or more conſentaneous to the Faith can be ſaid? *Appendix ad Leviath. Cap.* 1. On the contrary I will pronounce that nothing is more obſcure nor diſtentaneous to the Faith: *Tully* ſaid properly, *Ego tres ſuſtineo perſonas, mei Judicis adverſarij*, yet it muſt be granted, that the ſame word may have divers ſignifications, peculiarly in various ſciences, elſe the great and famous *Northern* Conſtellations may note the greateſt Bear in the *Muſcovian* Snowes. The Latine Fathers, and after them the Schools, and Divines, take not

not the word *Persona* in the same sence that Orators and Philosophers do; I believe that *Bellarmine* did know the meaning of the Latine word *persona* as well as Mr. *Hobs*. Let common sence be appealed, can the Mystery of the Trinity be explained according to *Cicero's* use of the word *Persona* For according to the Church of *England* in the *Athanasian Creed*, which is part of the Liturgy established by Law, and ratified in the 8 Article, in which are these words, *the Three Creeds, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, and that*

common-

commonly called the Apoſtles Creed, ought to be throughly received and believed. In the *Athanaſian*, the Eternity is not only of the Eſſence, but of the Perſons, not as *the Father Eternal, the Son Eternal, and the Holy Ghoſt Eternal*, but according to Mr. *Hobs* the Perſons were Temporal (*i. e.*) God became a Father, when he created the World, A Son when he redeemed Mankind, and the Holy Ghoſt when he Sanctifies; which is abſolutely contrary to the Faith: for upon the Impious account of Mr. *Hobs* the Perſons were not eternal, by

rea-

reason the Actions of God in creating the World, by which there was the personality of the Father, and of the Son in redeeming the World, and of the Holy Ghost in Sanctifying the Elect People of God, were temporal. Let this be Queried, What Sence is this? God redeemed Mankind in the person of his Son, *Persona mei* is *Tully* himself, but *Persona Judicis* is *Tully* representing a Judge; did God represent another in the redeeming of the World? This leads to the making good this Heresy concerning the Incarnation

of

of the Son of God, for he utterly denies the eternal *Filiation*, and ſaith that Chriſt being the Son of God was an eternal God, but as being begotten extraordinarily in time he acknowledgeth that expreſsly and frequently in the Scriptures Chriſt is ſaid to be begotten; that he was God born of the Father before the World; when Chriſt is ſaid to be begotten, tis meant, that he was begotten of God himſelf, the Father of the Matter of the Virgin, *Mat.* 1. *verſ.* 20. *that which was begotten of the Virgin Mary was of the Holy Ghoſt, and ſhould*

should be called the Son of God.

'But some perhaps will say
'that the eternal generation
'differs from that which was
'made in the Womb of the
'Virgin.

To which he thus answers, where doth the Holy Scripture or Synod thus distinguish? this Question is a certain demonstration that he denys the eternal generation and that he by a strange passion resolves to deny those things which for certain he knows to be true, if a stout denyal serves his designe. The sacred Scripture in several places is expres for the

iter

eternal generation, makeing it diſtant from the temporal. The ſcriptures were wreſted and falſe Gloſſes put upon them; *Arrius* did not deny the præexiſtence of the Son of God, who was Incarnate, the difference was not concerning the Eternal Generation, but the Conſubſtantiality.

Having thus proved, that his *Leviathan* contains certain Hæretical propoſitions; It remains, that I prove theſe Hereſies Criminal, and thus I ſtate the Queſtion and purſue it.

'Tis one of Mr. *Hob*'s great Artifices to avoid thoſe abſurdities into which his own ſentiments caſts him. Mr. *Hobs* percieving that he is juſtly charg'd with this imputation, writes the book call'd *The Hiſtorical Narrative of Hereſie.* The Parliament complain'd, That in it were contain'd ſeveral Heretical Opinions, *(i. e.)* Opinions declared Hereſie by the Church and Laws of *England:* he being a Subject to the King, is obliged to obedience to the Laws of his Soveraign. By this therefore he

he doth manifeſtly contradict himſelf, and oppoſeth theſe his great Moral and Political *Poſtulata's*. Nothing is 'Juſt or Unjuſt, but what is 'made ſo by Law, and that 'nothing is Criminal, but 'what a Penal Law prohibits.

From this his moſt juſt charge he would free his *Leviathan*; to ſhew that his attemts are frivolous, it muſt be prov'd, that his *Leviathan* doth contain Heretical Opinions. To which he returns, That there is no opinion that oppoſeth a Penal Statute; or that no Perſon can be juſtly by the Civil Magiſtrate pu-

nish'd for any Opinion contain'd in the *Leviathan*. For (saith he) 'All the *Penal* 'Laws against *Hereticks* were 'repeal'd in the Reign of 'Q. *Elizabeth*. To remedy 'the Inconvenience which 'might arise by Novel *Dog-* 'ma's, She apointed a Court, 'called the *High Commission*, 'to declare what was *Heresie*. 'But that *High Commission* ne- 'ver declared what was *He-* 'resie, or if they did, it was 'to no purpose, for they were 'not impower'd to inflict a- 'ny punishment upon an *He-* 'retick. Withal the Parlia- 'ment abolishing that Court,

no-

'nothing could be accounted
'*Heresie:* Besides the *Levia-*
'*than* was Printed in 1651.
'when it was lawful to Write
'or Preach any thing in mat-
'ters of Religion. To which
I suppose that some, nay ma-
ny things contained in the
Leviathan are *Heretical*, and
so judged by the Church, and
punishable by the Civil Ma-
jestrate. Not to mention ma-
ny, I will assign these Two.
The Nature of *God*, and the
Mystery of the Individual
Trinity are by him *Heretically*
and *Impiously* explicated. He
Blasphemously avers *God hath*
parts, and makes the Persons

of the Holy Trinity to be Temporal, not Eternal; both which are declared Heretical by the first Article,) and by the three Creeds. The *Athanasian Creed* is imbodyed into the Common Law, and that his opinion concerning the Trinity is Heretical is indubitable; waveing the Contests he strives violently to maintain, that Nothing in matters of Faith is declared Criminal by the Law, or punishable by the Civil Magestrate. For saith he the Lady *Elizabeth* in her first year repealed all the Laws *Ecclesiastical* of Queen *Mary*, and all other Laws

'Laws concerning the pun-
'iſhing of Hereticks, nor
'did She enact any other pun-
'iſhment in their place. Theſe lines he could not deliver without that ſame arrogance by which he explodes the Univerſityes, and accounts moſt of the Learned men in the World, Fools. For the Writs *de Heretico Comburendo* and *de excommunicato capiendo* were in force, he adds in the 2 place, it was enacted 'That
'the Queen by her Letters
'Patents ſhould give a Com-
'miſſion to the Biſhops with
'ſeveral other Perſons in her
'Majeſties name to execute

his

'his Power ecclesiastical, this 'is granted, (he proceeds) 'In which *Commission* the 'Commissioners were for-'bidden to adjudge any thing 'to be *Heresy* which was not 'declared to be *Heresy* by 'some of the four first Gene-'ral Concils, nor was there 'any thing in that Commissi-'on concerning how Here-'ticks ought to be punished. 'But it was granted to them 'to declare, or not declare to 'be *Heresy* or not *Heresy* as 'they pleased, any of those 'Doctrines which had been 'condemned in the four first 'general Councils for *Here-*

sie.

'ſie. To refute this, and what he ſubjoyns, tis requiſite that I give the words of the Statute. 'They ſhall not '(meaning the *High Com-* 'miſſioners) have Authority 'or Power to order deter- 'mine or adjudge any matter 'or cauſe to be *Hereſy*, but 'only ſuch as heretofore 'have been determined, or- 'dered or adjudged to be '*Hereſy* by the Authority of 'the Canonical Scriptures, 'or by the firſt four general 'Councils, or any of them, 'or by any other General 'Council, wherein the ſame 'was declared *Hereſy* by the ex-

'expreſs and plain words 'of the ſaid Canonical 'Scriptures, or ſuch as here-'after ſhall be ordered, deter-'mined or adjudged to be '*Hereſy* by the High Court of 'Parliament of this Realme, 'with the aſſent of the Cler-'gy in their Convocation. By this it appears what a lame and falſe account he gives of the Statute, for the *Queen*, and her Parliament did not leave it indifferent to the *High Commiſſion* to determine what was or what was not *Hereſy*, but limits them (to declare what was *Hereſy* or not *Hereſy*) not only to the four

four firſt general Councils (as he ſeems falſely to inſinuate) but likewiſe to the expreſs words of Scripture, and to the Parliament) which he ſeems to exclude, for he omits the mentioning of them; 'Nor was there (he adds) in 'that *Commiſſion* any thing 'concerning how *Hereticks* 'ought to be puniſhed. The *High Commiſſion* could not inflict capital puniſhment. I hope Mr *Hobs* will not ſay there is no crime, but twas capitall. That the *High Commiſſion* had power to puniſh perſons in caſe of *Hereſy* is evident both by the Law of *England*, and practice of that Court

Court. By the Law of *England* expresly by the Act *Elizab.* that Court was Invested wth all *Ecclesiastical* power before the Cancelling of the *High-Commisson*, the Bishops had a Power to Imprison persons, and the Writ *de excommunicato capiendo* still continues. The words of the 'Act are that the Queen, 'or any of her Successors 'should nominate one or 'more persons to use, exercise, 'and occupy, all manner of 'jurisdictions, priviledges or 'preeminences in any wise 'touching, or concerning any 'spiritual or Ecclesiastical 'jurisdiction, and to visit reforme

'reforme, redreſs, order, cor-
'rect and amend all ſuch Er-
'rors, Hereſies, Schiſmes
&c. It was perfect nonſence
for a Parliament to enable
the Engliſh Soveraign to e-
rect a Court to puniſh and
amend Errors and *Hereſies*,
if the Law of *England* had
not declared what was an
Hereſy, and likewiſe not to
Inveſt them with power to
accompliſh ſuch ends, which
they had not, if they could
not inflict puniſhments, he
returned. 'The juriſdiction
'was onely ſpiritual: but to
that was annexed a civil
puniſhment. Upon excom-
munication there lay a Writ

de excommunicato capiendo: that a Person excommunicated for *Heresy* or Errors in Doctrine, by that Writ might be Imprisoned, is clear as the day. Certainly imprisonment is a civil Punishment. This Writ lay against those who were obstinate Offenders in Causes Ecclesiastical is evident by 5 *Eliz. Cap.* 23. with the *significavit* to be added to the Writ, and in that *Significavit* 'tis joyn'd that the Excommunication doth proceed upon some cause of some Original matter of *Heresy*, or Error in Religion or Doctrine, now received and allowed in the said Church of

Eng-

England, whereby it appears that Perſons for *Hereſy* might be Impriſoned, and ſo *Hereſy* to become Criminal. For it was to be puniſhed by the civil Magiſtrate with Corporal Mulcts; and farther lay a Writ *de Heretico comburendo*; if nothing was declared *Hereſy*, why did their lye ſuch a Writ. That ſuch a Writ was in force, is clear by the annulling of it, when this fetal Plot was detected, then the Parliament made an Act to Cancel it; either it was in force, or not; if in force, the Parliament was Prudent in making it

void, if not it casts a reproach upon the Two Houses to annul that which was exploded. That these Writs were in force is declared, and that the Writ *de excommunicato capiendo* retains its Vigor, is evinc'd by the usage of the Kingdome of *England*. As for the Writ *de Heretico comburendo*, it was put in execution in King *James* his time. *Legat & Wightman* were Burnt, the one in *Smith-field*, and the other in *Litchfield*, for the *Arrian Heresy*. He saith, that they which approve such executions may peradventure know better grounds for

for them then I do. But grounds are very well worthy to be enquired after: but he might very well know the just grounds for them. He that affirms the Law to be the Sole rule of just and unjust could not be ignorant that by the common Law of *England*, the Writ *de Heretico comburendo* was valid, and thereupon an *Heretick* might legally be Burnt. My Lord *Cook part* 3. *cap.* 5. affirms that by the Books of the common Law the King Issuing out his VVrit *de Heretico comburendo*, an *Heretick* ought to be Burnt. That *Heresy* might

be puniſhed by Corporeal and pecuniary Mulcts, is clear by the Queens Letters Patents, authorized by the 1. Statute of her Reign. She did give to the Arch Biſhop of *Cant.* the Biſhop of *London*, and divers others, any Three or more of them, full Power and Authority to reforme, redreſs, order, correct, and amend &c. and to have full Power and Authority to order and award, to every ſuch offendor by Fine, Impriſonment, Cenſure of the Church, or otherways, or all or any of the ſaid ways. *Cawdrys Caſe.* and in

in that ſame caſe it is reſolved by the Judges, that the Statute of the Firſt of Queen *Elizabeth* did not introduce any new Law, but declared an ancient one. The Title of the Statute being an Act reſtoring to the Crown the Ancient juriſdiction over the State Eccleſiaſtical and Spiritual. The Sovereign, being the Supream head of the Church, without whoſe Authority no perſon can or ought to exerciſe any Eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction, or proceed to any Cenſure; it demonſtrates that by the Royal Power an *Heretick* might be pun-

punished with a Civil and Corporeal Mulct. Farther the *Star-Chamber* was an ancient Court grounded upon the common Law of *England*, and confirmed by Act of Parliament. Which Court took cognizance not onely of Civil Crimes but also of Ecclesiastical, and did punish *Hereticks* by Imprisoning, Fineing and Stigmatizeing, as appears by the Records of that Court; and that famous Instance of *Thrask*, who in the 16. year of King *James* for spreading of *Judaical Heresies*, he was cited into the Court and being obsti-

nate

nate was ſentenced to be ſet in the Pillory, Whipt to the Fleet, Fined and Impriſoned, all which was executed: by which it appears what truth there is in this aſſertion of Mr. *Hobs*. During the Time the *High Commiſſion* was in being, there was no Statute by which an *Heretick* might be puniſhed otherwiſe than by the ordinary Cenſure of the Church, for 'tis proved that by the Common Law of *England* and the Statute Law during the time of the *High Commiſſion*, *Hereticks* might ſuffer in their Bodies and Purſes: hence it follows that

He-

Hereſy was criminal, and he hath not vindicated himſelf from that contradiction with which he ſtands charged. He farther proceeds. That no 'Doctrine could be account-'ed *Hereſy*, unleſs *Commiſſio-'ners* had actually declared 'and publiſhed, that what 'was made *Hereſy* by the 'Four firſt general Councils 'ſhould be *Hereſie*: but I never heard yet there was any ſuch declaration made either by Proclamation, by Recording in Churches, or by Printing, as is requiſite in Penal Laws. We have before proved that the *High Commiſſion*

miſſion was not the Sole Judges of *Hereſy*. That which the Church and Law of *England* condemns for *Hereſy*, is as fully divulged as can be expected. The 39. Articles are ſufficiently known, and thoſe Doctrines which the Four firſt general Councils received as Orthodox, or condemned as Heretical, are ratifi'd by the Law and Church of *England*, and ſufficiently promulged: The *Nicene* Creed which was completed by the Fourth general Council is read in every Church on Sundaies and Holy daies: The *Athanaſian*

sian Creed is to be read at peculiar Festivals, both which Creeds, as also the Apostles, are part of the *Liturgy* of the Church, which is imbodyed into the Laws of the Land, and that the opinions which are contrary, are made Heretical appeats by these Clauses of the *Athanasian* Creed, *He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity. Furthermore it is Necessary to Everlasting Salvation that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ:* and this Clause ends the Creed, *This is the Catholick Faith which except a man*

man believe Faithfully he cannot be ſaved. The Doctrines therefore declared to be Heretical are ſufficiently, by Printing and Recording in Churches, divulged. To alleviate his Crime, or at leaſt to vindicate himſelf from Hereſie, he reflects upon our late ſad diſtractions, wch to me adminiſters matter of horror. 'Before arms were taken up, 'ſaith he, 'the King aboliſhed the *High Commiſſion*, but 'the Parliament purſued the 'Rebellion, and put down 'both Epiſopacy and Monar-'chy, erecting a power, by 'them called a *Common wealth*,

'by others the *Rump*, which 'men obeyed not out of Duty 'but Fear, thoſe actions were dreadfull, and are the fontinels of all thoſe fears which now afflict us. The juſt principles by which Government is formed and eſtabliſhed, and reaſonable laws are enacted, deſervedly reprove and condemn thoſe actions, perpetrated in our late confuſions, which gave a ſcandall to our Religion and Nation: But how can he caſt an odium upon thoſe actions his ſentiments juſtifie. Saith 'he, there were no humane 'Laws left in force to reſtrain

'ſtrain any man from 'Preaching, or Writing any 'Doctrine concerning Reli-'gion that he pleaſed. And 'in this time it was, that a 'book called the *Leviathan* 'was writ in defence of the 'Kings Power Spiritual or 'Temporal, without any 'word againſt Epiſcopacy, 'or againſt Biſhop, or a-'gainſt the publick Doctrine 'of the Church. To which tis thus Replyed, the *Levia-than* was impreſſed 1651, and come out in Latine upon 'his Majeſties returne. In 48 '*England* was totally ſubdu-'ed to the Power of the

'*Rump*, *Ireland* in 49. *Scot-*
'*land* in 51. was almost reduct
'by the *Rump*, and his Ma-
'jesties Army totally routed
'at *Worcester*, in this year the
'*Leviathan* was publisht,
'was this Book in defence of
'the Kings Power, Spiritu-
'al and Temporal, when his
'Majestie was in Banishment?
His Majestie was then de-
vested of all his lawfull Pow-
er and Authority, and forc't
into Exile; This *Leviathan*,
if the Principles were admit-
ed, justfied the Actions of
his Enemies; he casts this
Imputation on the *Rump*,
that they were obeyed onely
for

for fear; in the ſame book he endeavours to prove that man is not by Nature a lover of Society, but at his original is in a ſtate of War; The dread of the Evils which are incident to that condition, makes him to enter into a Society with others; and let it be conſidered, whether, if Fear be the great inducement to Government, they according to his Principles are to be condemned who out of the ſame fear obeyed the *Rump*, and that the fundamental law of Nature is *ſelf Preſervation*, and for fear that end ſhould not be attained, pacts are entred

entred into, but if after thoſe pacts that deſign cannot be accompliſhed, then pacts are void: and therefore if people have a ſuſpicion that the Prince will deſtroy them, they may take up Arms. And if the Prince be deveſted of his Government, the People are no longer obliged to obey him, and upon this account of *Self-Preſervation*, they are to ſubmit to thoſe who can protect them. Upon this reaſon the taking the Engagement was lawful, and it was his honour to preſent to the *Engliſh* Nation thoſe Principles wch induced ma-

many to take the Engagement.

Oliver gaining the *Protectorſhip*, was ſo pleaſed with him on thoſe accounts, that the great place of being *Secretary* was profered him. If theſe things be true, (as unqueſtionably they are) let it then be conſidered, whether any Sober man can believe that the Book called the *Leviathan* was writ in defence of the Kings Power, Temporal and Eccleſiaſtical; ſince it manifeſtly aſſerts the cauſe of Uſurpers. It muſt be granted that Mr. *Hobs* doth give to the Soveraign all illimited pow-

power in things just and sacred. But this he gives to all sorts of Government, to *Aristocracy* and *Democracy* as well as *Monarchy*.

A Book to be penned and published by him, when all the Kings Dominions were in the Power of those who took up Arms against him, which containes these Doctrines. *Pag.* 112. 'But in case 'a great many men have already resisted the Soveraign 'Power unjustly, or committed some Capital Crime, 'for which every one of them 'expects Death, whether 'have they not the Liberti

then

'then to joyn together, and as-
'sist, and defend one another?
certainly they have: for they
'but defend their lives,
'which the Guilty man may
'as well do, as the Innocent.
'There was indeed Injustice
'in the first breach of their
'Duty; Their bearing of
'Arms subsequent to it, tho
'it be to maintain what they
'have done, is no new un-
'just Act; and if it be
'only to defend their per-
'sons it is not unjust at all.
'*Pag.* 114. The Obligati-
'on of Subjects to the Sove-
'raign is understood to last
'as long and no longer than
the

'the power lasteth, by 'which he is able to protect 'them. For the Right men 'have by nature to protect 'themselves, when none else 'can protect them, can by 'no covenant be relinquish-'ed; The Soveraignty is 'he Soul of the Common-'wealth, which once depar-'ted from the body, the 'members do no more recieve 'their motion from it. *Pag.* '174. When in a War (for-'raine or intestine) the E-'nemies get a final Victory, 'so as the forces of the Com-'mon Wealth keeping the 'Field no longer) there is no ther

'ther protection of Subjects
'in their Loyalty; then is
'the Common-wealth diſſol-
'ved, and every man at liber-
'ty to protect himſelf by
'ſuch cauſes as his own diſ-
'cretion ſhall ſuggeſt unto
'him. For the Soveraign is
'the publick Soul, giveing
'Life and motion to the
'Common-wealth, which ex-
'piring, the Members are
'governed by it no more,
'than the Carcaſs of a man
'by his departed (tho im-
'mortal) Soul. For tho the
'Right of a Soveraign Mo-
'narch cannot be extinguiſh-
'ed by the Act of another,
yet

'yet the Obligation of the 'members may. For he that 'wants protection may ſeek 'it any where, and when he 'hath it, is obliged (without 'fraudulous pretence of ha-'ving ſubmitted himſelf out 'of fear) to protect his 'Protector as long as he is a-'ble. It was ſo far from de-fending His Majeſties Au-thority, that without Com-mand they plainly juſtifie the actions of his uſurping Enemies. No perſon that hath ſuckt in *Hobs* his Principles, can be a loyal Subject, and hence likewiſe it appears, that he did not ingeniouſly with

with his Majeſty, when he averts in his Apology for his *Leviathan*, in an Epiſtle dedicated to the King, before *Problemata Phiſica, nec vitio vertant quod contra Hoſtes pugnans &c.* Let none account me a Criminal, that fighting againſt your Enemies I took what Arms I could, and Brandiſhed a two Edged Sword; certainly thoſe Propoſitions Fought againſt his Majeſty, and defended the Cauſe of of his Enemies; That in the ſame book he did write againſt Biſhops and the Doctrine of the Church of *England* is manifeſtly proved be-

fore. In the Common-Prayer book are contained ſeveral Doctrines of the Church of *England*, to oppoſe or deny which (as Mr. *Hobs* doth in the aforeſaid book) is made Criminal, that is to be puniſhed by the Civil magiſtrate, by the firſt of Queen *Eliza. Cap.* 2. The Title of which is, That there be Uniformity of Prayer and Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, in which there are theſe words.

'Be it enacted, that every Per'ſon or Perſons whatſoever 'that ſhall in any Interludes 'Plays, Songs, Rhymes, or by 'any other open words de-

clare

'clare or ſpeak any thing de-
'praving or deſpiſeing the
'ſame Book, or any part
'thereof, or any thing there-
'in contained, then the par-
'ty convicted ſhall forfeit to
'the Queen for the firſt
'Offence an Hundred Marks.
He concludes this Tract with caſting an odious and falſe Scandal upon the whole Chriſtian Clergy; Down from the whole Council of *Nice* to this preſent time, in theſe words;

'So fierce are men for the
'moſt part in diſpute, where
'either their Learning or
'Power is debated, that they

'never think of the Laws,
'but as soon as they are
'offended they cry out Cru-
'cify, forgetting what *Paul*
'saith, even in case of obsti-
'nate holding of an Error. 2.
'*Tim.* 24. 25. The Servant
'of the Lord must not strive,
'but be gentle unto all men,
'apt to Teach, Patient, in
'Meekness Instructing those
'that oppose, if God perad-
'venture may give them Re-
'pentance to the acknow-
'ledging of the Truth. Tis
true both the Bishops and
the Presbyterians did accuse
that Book (in the Parlia-
ment) of Heresy: why could
they

they be fierce, their learning and their power being not diſputed, when he profeſſes in that book he medled not with them, their power, or learning. Thoſe things make not the Clergy fierce; tis the Perſon, the Religion, the Faith of the Holy Jeſus for which the Clergy have been and are ſtill ſo Zealouſly contending; they are, and were piouſly fierce in oppoſing prophane Hereſies, and Blaſphemous Impieties; the Zeal of the Lord of Hoſts hath eaten up thoſe holy Divines; their zelous defence of the Doctrine of their maſter hath

hath not violated the Apostles direction given to the Pastors of the Church 2. *Tim.* that reaches only those who erred through infirmity, not obstinacy. Contumacious Hereticks they are bound to oppose withall Holy Zeal and Indignation. Did not he blush to averr that they cryed Crucifie, when they knew not the Law. Could they be ignorant of that Law which they themselves put in execution: Their ignorance of the Law did not make them cry Crucifie, but knowing the Law and Gospel became profest Enemies to those who by their

their Antichriſtian opinions Crucifie again the Lord of Glory.

What Reproach caſts he upon Religion when he loads the Chriſtian Divines with ſuch imputations. Thoſe that are verſt in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and have read the Fathers, cannot but conclude that the *Baſil's*, the *Gregory's* &c. were men as great for Learning and Goodneſs as the World ever produced; their fervent oppoſition of Hereticks was not contrariant to that Apoſtoliocal Precept. The Holy Chriſtian Divines (obeying the

the Apostolical Commands *Titus* 3.10. *An Heretick after the first and second Admonition reject*, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. *If any one bring another Doctrine, receive him not into your house, nor bid him good speed.*) down from the Apostles time to this day have and will be till Christ come to Judgement, Zealous and Pious oppofers of those who privately bring in damnable *Heresies* denying the Lord that bought them.

FINIS.

TRINITY COLLEGE
CAMBRIDGE